



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,420	12/19/2001	Mike Levanduski	326.1001	2519

7590

07/01/2004

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC  
14th Floor  
485 Seventh Avenue  
New York, NY 10018

EXAMINER
----------

KAUSHAL, SUMESH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1636

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8/12

## Office Action Summary

### Application No.

10/026,420

### Applicant(s)

LEVANDUSKI, MIKE

### Examiner

Sumesh Kaushal Ph.D.

### Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-76 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-9, drawn to Non-embryonic stem cells wherein the cell differentiation is inhibited when the cells are cultured on fibroblast feeder layer, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- II. Claims 10-18, drawn to Non-embryonic stem cells wherein the cell differentiation is inhibited in the absence of fibroblast feeder layer, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- III. Claims 19-29 and 69-76, drawn to a Stem cell originated from nuclear transfer of a somatic cell nucleus to an enucleated ooplastoid, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- IV. Claims 30-40 and 69-76, drawn to a Stem cell produced by culturing a Nascent cell, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- V. Claims 41-46 and 69-76, drawn to a Nascent cell produced by combination of a somatic cell nucleus and an enucleated zona pellucida free ooplastoid, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- VI. Claims 47-56 and 69-76, drawn to a method of producing Pluripotent non-embryonic stem cells by culturing a Nascent cell, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- VII. Claims 57-68, 69-76, drawn to a method of producing Pluripotent Non-embryonic stem cells produced from a super-ooplast derived from one or more enucleated zona pellucida free oocytes, classified in class 435, subclass 325.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are distinct. Inventions are distinct if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of

operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the Non-embryonic stem cells of group I have different modes of operation, functions or effects from the Non-embryonic stem cells of group II, since the Non-embryonic stem cells of group II are capable of proliferating in-vitro culture for an indefinite period in the absence of a fibroblast feeder layers rather than the presence of fibroblast cells (group I). Thus these inventions are distinct and are of separate uses.

Inventions III and IV are distinct. Inventions are distinct if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the Stem cells of group III are produced by nuclear transfer of a somatic cell nucleus to an enucleated ooplastoid, whereas the stem cell of group IV are produced by culturing a Nascent cell. Since ooplastoid and nascent cells are materially different product and requires materially different process to produce stem cells these inventions are distinct and are of separate uses.

Inventions VI and VII are distinct. Inventions are distinct if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the Pluripotent non-embryonic stem cells of group VII are produced by nuclear transfer of a somatic cell nucleus to an enucleated ooplastoid, whereas the Pluripotent non-embryonic stem cells of group VI are produced by culturing a Nascent cell. Since ooplastoid and nascent cells are materially different product and requires materially different process to produce stem cells these inventions are distinct and are of separate uses.

Inventions I and II (non-embryonic stem cells), III and IV (stem cells), VI and VII (Pluripotent non-embryonic stem cells) and V (nascent cells) are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because non-

Art Unit: 1636

embryonic stem cells can be produced by a method that does not require nuclear transfer or nascent cell differentiation. Furthermore a stem cell could also be produced by nuclear transfer of enucleated ooplastoid rather than by culturing nascent cells. In addition besides making stem cells the nascent cells could also be used to make Pluripotent non-embryonic stem cells. The subcombination has separate utility such as Pluripotent non-embryonic stem cells, non-embryonic stem cells and stem cells produced by different methods that requires materially different protocols and reagents that has different modes of operations and effects.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Claim 69-76 link(s) inventions I-VII. The restriction requirement among the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claim 69-76. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sumesh Kaushal Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0769. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri. from 9AM-5PM. If

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yucel Irem Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0781.

*Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.*

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Sumesh Kaushal  
Examiner GAU 1636



**SUMESH KAUSHAL**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**